

RICHMOND, VA.

We confidently believe that there will be two companies of United States Dragoons ordered by the Government to act as an escort for the pro-

We have no doubt, continued many things

[illegible]

J. R. KANNADY,
JOHN F. WHEELER. *Agents.*

FORT SMITH, January 25, 1899.

P. S. It is not our intention to mislead any one by our Circular, but to aid in candor say to whom are coming from outside to bring their dogs to, as our country is yet new and the demand is so great that it will be difficult to procure such dogs. It is not our intention to procure such dogs by means of a long-distance transportation to this place, but to have come and answer their purpose here than any they could procure here, for all may rest assured that we have not happened to examine, will not pass any reason they may have, but are fully going through to stand the trip. Every one going will see the necessity and propriety of this—pay strict attention to the above, and do not let any notices to the contrary lead any one to regret his having followed our advice.

For the Enquirer.
EASTERN EXTENSION OF THE LOUISIANA RAILROAD.

The signal vote in the House of Delegates on Saturday, which rejected, by a majority of four to one, the application of the Louisiana Company for a subscription to the proposed extension of the railroad, has been widely interpreted that the existing law, which forbids the removal of the right of way, would be in violation of good policy, by the end of the charter rights of the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad Company. In view of these considerations, a few words of explanation will be given.

It is singular that 'Fiat Justitia,' who seems to have obtained the meaning of the word 'between' from the dictionary of Johnson and Walker, should have overlooked the words 'between' in the same dictionary, and that the word given in the dictionary. On reference the dictionary referred to, (that of Johnson, improved by Todd, with Walker's supplementary definitions) combined in the word 'between' the definition of the intermediate space *between two objects*; that, therefore, so far from the dictionary coming to the aid of 'Fiat Justitia,' in expounding the law, its authority is directly against him, and protects the Company both in the construction of the law, and in the construction of the dictionary.

The argument of 'Fiat Justitia,' in relation to the 'through travel,' is quite so unfortunate as his reference to the dictionary. He agrees that the obvious meaning of the Legislature must have been, that his other rail-road should be a *through travel* from the city of Washington to the city of Richmond, and the city of Washington for any *part* of the distance between them, as that the 'probable effect would be to diminish the number of passengers travelling between the city of Washington and the city of Richmond, or to compel the Company, in order to retain such passengers to reduce the passage money;' and adds: 'Now, as to the construction of any other railroad between the two cities, for less than the distance between the two cities, for less distance, it is admitted that it is possible, or perhaps probable, that the rivalry mentioned by the

If "Fair Justice" will examine the charter of the Louisiana Railroad Company, he will find that the Legislature reserves to itself the right to make a railroad between *Fredericksburg* and Washington. Now, supposing, since a road to be made, and the Louisiana Railroad extended to Washington, that the distance between the two cities would exist for *more than two-thirds of the distance* between the cities of Richmond and Washington, (instead of *one-fifth*), and, therefore, according to the admission of "Fair Justice," that the Louisiana Railroad Company, by its violation of the charter of the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Company,

"Fair Justice" remarks, in conclusion, in regard to the prosecution of the Eastern extension of the Louisiana Railroad Company, "if a Stockholder will take the trouble to go up in the line of their proposed extension now under contract for the whole distance, he will find that they are showing no more than a perfectly bona fide intention."

With these "words" of the President and Directors of the Louisiana Company "A Stockholder" not being a stockholder of the Louisiana Company, has nothing to do, and he has no interest, him or his property, in the proposed extension, or in the charter of the Louisiana Company. If he was a stockholder in the Louisiana Company, he would be very apt, when it is ascertained that these words *are* used, to require whether the expenditure authorized for them was *not* for the benefit of the Louisiana Company, and not for the benefit of his property, as was so authorized, (as it ap-

part was to have been.) In ascertaining whether the loss was his fall, he would be apt to leave the President and *liberals* and the contractors to their quarrel between themselves, instead of allowing hasty and unauthorized engagements; they should so prove, to be saddled on the Company. A STOCKHOLDER.

SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS
Prescott, Judges Cobb, B. B. Clark, Allen, Baldwin, and Danahy.

February 26, 27, 28.—*Daniels*, the Judge of the court of chancery for the Richmond circuit, argued by Macfarland against, and by Patton in favor of, waiving the mortgage.

March 2. Manulama awarded returnable to the second day of April.

March 1. Dejanets vs. Allen and wife. Affirmed.

March 3. Tott vs. Slaughter's adm'r. (Judge C. Bell above.) Reversed.

Law's exors. vs. Sutherland. Reversed.

Hume vs. Hoffed. (Judges Brooke and Allen absent.) Affirmed.

Washington vs. Pollard, and same vs. Lumpkin. Judge Brooke absent. Reversed.

Matthews vs. Deprist and others. Rule for additional security returnable to the second of April.

March 5. Mayo vs. Anderson, &c. Appeal allowed.

Court adjourned till the second day of April.

SPECIAL COURT OF APPEALS.

February 26. Hutchinson vs. Bruce. (Judge Leitch absent). Affirmed.

February 26. 27. Echols vs. Carpenter, &c., and the same vs. Lambeth, &c. Summed up, printed arguments by counsel for appellants, and for appellees, and argued orally by Baker for appellants.

March 28. Reversed in part, but with costs in favour of appellees.

March 27. Burchett vs. Goodwyn's ex'or. Reversed.

Brand vs. Daval, &c. (Judge Lomax absent). Affirmed.

February 26, and March 1 and 2. Clarke vs. Galt, Farquhar, & Wells and Patton for appellants, and Robinson for appellees; and submitted by Cooke on printed argument for appellees.

March 5. Reversed.

March 2. Peersburg Railroad Company vs. Jones. Decree affirmed.

Absent—Judge Field.

March 3, 5 and 6. Morton vs. Page, &c. (Judge Lomax absent) Argued by Robinson and Patton for appellants, and G. N. Johnson and Standard for appellees.

March 8. Reversed.

March 7. Lemon vs. Lemon, &c. Reheard.

March 8. Decree affirmed.

March 6. Eussace vs. Adams' adm'r. (2 cases). Reversed.

Court adjourned till the court in course.